Inside this issue:

- **Jackson Hole-in-the-Wall Gang: The Fed's Annual Bankster Palaver**
- **National Debt Hits $37 trillion as Deficit Increases**
- **Digital "WorldID": Sam Altman, AI, and the Fed**
- **The Biometric Surveillance State Is Already Here**
- **Are DNA Inclusion, Microchip Implants Next?**
- **"Ugly Stripper" TSA vs. Senators in Battle Over Facial Scans**
- **Heroic Whistleblower Nurse Exposes Covid Vax and Fetal Deaths**
- **Trump's Constitution-crushing National Guard Coup in Washington, D.C.**
- **Saving Babies: Texas Town Becomes 79th "Sanctuary City" for the Unborn**
- **The Cruel Paradox of Human Nature and the Necessity of Guarding Liberty**

Jackson Hole-in-the-Wall Gang: The Fed's Annual Bankster Palaver

Next week is the annual Jackson Hole Economic Policy Symposium, one of the oldest central banking conferences in the world. Hosted by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, the event brings together central bankers, Federal Reserve representatives, economists, financiers, government officials, and a few handpicked journalists. Launched in 1978, the symposium has long been a top forum for central bankers to strategize about monetary policy — which in laymen's terms means devising ever-more subtle methods for inflating the money supply without undue disruption and without the general public figuring out the game. The theme of this year's symposium — "Labor Markets in Transition: Demographics, Productivity, and Macroeconomic Policy" — is characteristically vague, but all papers from this and past symposia are posted online, since the event is more of an occasion for airing new ideas than for formulating policy.

The popularity of such events reflects the undeniable fact that central banking is a complex endeavor. But it is an entirely unnecessary one. For all of the energy expended over the decades in devising and refining new monetary policies and the novel financial instruments to implement them, the entire edifice of modern central banking is supported by a false ideological foundation — the supposed need for centralized control over the money supply. The very notion of centralization is implied by the term "central bank," and yet few perceive the irony of a centrally planned money supply amid a supposedly free market economy for which any kind of collectivist central planning is anathema. In fact, there is no mystical aura attached to money rendering it somehow distinct from all other market commodities and in need of benign oversight. Yet thousands of otherwise rational civic leaders, economists, and policymakers have seen fit for several generations to expend their lives and talents trying to improve upon what the free market, left to its own devices, can do better than any think tank or planning committee: establish the supply and value of money relative to all other goods and services.

And until more Americans awaken to this reality, events like the Jackson Hole Symposium will continue to

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

William F. Jasper • John T. Larabell • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2025 by *The New American*

provide a forum for the formulation of monetary deceit. — Steve Bonta

National Debt Hits $37 trillion as Deficit Increases

The U.S. gross national debt has officially surpassed $37 trillion. The Associated Press reports:

> The $37 trillion update is found in the latest Treasury Department report issued Tuesday which logs the nation's daily finances.
>
> The national debt eclipsed $37 trillion years sooner than pre-pandemic projections. The Congressional Budget Office's January 2020 projections had gross federal debt eclipsing $37 trillion after fiscal year 2030. But the debt grew faster than expected because of a multi-year COVID-19 pandemic starting in 2020 that shut down much of the U.S. economy, where the federal government borrowed heavily under then-President Donald Trump and former President Joe Biden to stabilize the national economy and support a recovery.

Meanwhile, the federal deficit has increased compared to last year. Fox Business reports:

> The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) on Friday released its monthly budget update for July, which found that the federal budget deficit totaled $1.6 trillion in the first 10 months of fiscal year 2025. That figure is $109 billion higher than it was for the same period in FY2024.
>
> Overall, federal tax receipts were up $263 billion, or 6%, while spending outpaced that gain, rising by $372 billion, or 7%, in the first 10 months of FY2025.
>
> Much of the rise in federal tax revenue was driven by the Trump administration's tariffs, which are taxes on imported goods that the White House has increased markedly on U.S. trading partners over the course of this year.

#1
Veterinarian Recommended Brand
COSEQUIN®
JOINT HEALTH SUPPLEMENT
Cosequin® has a variety of formulas to help support your pet's healthy joints and cartilage.
Visit WWW.COSEQUIN.COM
nutramax LABORATORIES VETERINARY SCIENCES, INC.

These statistics show that the federal government doesn't have a revenue problem — but has a serious spending problem that threatens our very existence as a nation.

Especially over the last 100 years, the size and scope of the federal government have expanded significantly beyond its constitutional limits. The vast majority of federal agencies and expenditures are unconstitutional.

Unfortunately, the federal government will continue to grow. The One Big Beautiful Bill Act, enacted last month, raises the debt limit by $5 trillion, and is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to increase the national debt by an additional $3.2 trillion — on top of the current rate of debt accumulation — by 2034 (assuming the tax-cut extensions are factored in).

Congress must slash all spending not specifically authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. Contact your U.S. representative and senators, and urge them to follow the Constitution and

take decisive action to prevent an impending fiscal disaster. — Peter Rykowski

Digital "WorldID": Sam Altman, AI, and the Fed

On July 22, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors held its "Integrated Review of the Capital Framework for Large Banks Conference," and one of the panelists was OpenAI CEO Sam Altman. Altman was there to pitch his WorldID scheme to America's top international bankers — a global financial security system that, Altman has been arguing for some time, has become necessary because of AI. Altman warned the central bankers:

> AI has fully defeated most of the ways that people authenticate — all of these fancy, take a selfie, wave, or do your voice or whatever. I am very nervous that we have a significant impending fraud crisis.

Altman pointed out, for example, that AI already is capable of overcoming voice recognition software. The only solution, per Altman, is to adopt some version of his global digital retinal scan program, WorldID, which will in effect mandate digital identification for all financial transactions, via a blockchain-based digital ID tied to iris biometrics. What Altman and his cronies envisage is a global cryptocurrency, Worldcoin (launched in 2023), accessible via iris biometrics, which will undergird the entire world financial system, conferring both ironclad, AI-proof security — and the ability to track all internet financial transactions globally. So secure are Altman and his fellow technocrats in the inevitability of such a system that Worldcoin CEO Alex Blania pronounced confidently in 2023 that "[s]omething like World ID will eventually exist, meaning that you will need to verify [you are human] on the internet, whether you like it or not."

This is, of course, just the latest instance of an old technocratic trick: create a technological problem via new advanced tech (AI, in this case) — and then propose some other new tech to solve the problem. In this case, though, the potential consequences for privacy are truly devastating. After all, intrusive as social media may be, they are ultimately optional. Anyone determined to safeguard his privacy can stay off social media and anonymize all other internet-based activities with the help of a VPN. But financial transactions are a different kettle of fish. Restricting access to online commerce to those willing to receive a global digital ID is the stuff dystopian nightmares — and the fondest dreams of globalists with messianic complexes — are made of.

As for Altman's audience of elite bankers, it's not clear whether he is yet being taken seriously at the Fed. But experimentation with retinal digital IDs is already well underway in the EU (Spain and Portugal in particular), albeit still on a voluntary basis. In any case, the opinions of men such as Altman and Blania need to be taken more seriously, especially as AI continues gaining in potency and creating stronger and stronger rationale for the long-sought global ID. — Steve Bonta

The Biometric Face/Eye-Scan Surveillance State Is Already Here

The Big Brother/Big Tech Surveillance State is rocketing forward under Trump 47. As we reported, Secretary of Homeland Security Kristi Noem announced in April that "Starting May 7, you will need a REAL ID to travel by air or to visit federal buildings in the United States. These IDs keep our country safe because they help prevent fraud and they enhance security. Please do your part to protect our country. Go today and don't delay."

Passed in the panic after the 9/11 terror attacks, the REAL ID law is a massive assault on personal privacy and a huge federal usurpation of states' rights. Public and state resistance to the law has kept it in abeyance for two decades. But not anymore; Trump 47 is pushing full steam ahead. Over the years, we have reported many times on the dangers of REAL ID (see here, here, and here, for instance). See also Dr. Ron Paul's column

"REAL ID: Phony Security, Real Authoritarianism" from *The New American* on April 24, 2025.

As if the REAL ID assault is not serious enough, we now also must contend with the Transportation Security Administration's shiny new security toy — facial scanners — which TSA euphemistically markets as "second-generation Credential Authentication Technology (CAT-2)."

Originally rolled out during the Biden administration in 25 "select airports," CAT-2 was expanded to 84 airports (under Trump), then to 250 airports, and soon, reportedly, to 400 airports. Anyone who has run the airport "security" gauntlet recently has probably experienced the unnerving scene of fellow travelers, in bovine docility, marching up to the TSA security podium and submitting to the facial scan machine. What do you do when it's your turn? Submit, of course, because you don't want to hold up the line, draw attention to yourself, or invite a full-body grope or strip search. No worries, says TSA, the facial scan is "voluntary." However, that is not obvious to uninformed travelers, and signage explaining the voluntary nature of the intrusion is, if not nonexistent, virtually invisible. Besides, TSA assures us, the facial scans are not permanently stored; they are immediately deleted after matching your scan with your photo on your Real ID or passport. But that assurance is *qualified*. Digging a little deeper we find this: "Under *normal operating conditions* TSA facial comparison technology deletes traveler data and images immediately after your identity is verified." (Emphasis added.) And then, this:

> *In rare instances TSA will collect and temporarily retain photos and data* to test the accuracy of TSA's facial comparison technology. These data collection mode events are *limited in time and place* and begin with passenger notification signs. If you decline to participate you will receive standard identity verification and will not lose your place in line. [Emphasis added.]

No worries, right? Who could *imagine* politicians, bureaucrats, of dictators taking advantage of such weasel words? *"Normal operating conditions," "In rare instances,"* etc. Only a crazy conspiracy theorist would conjure up such "slippery slope" nightmare scenarios! After all, TSA insists, it is committed to "protecting privacy and civil liberties." Whew, what a relief! You can take that pledge to the bank! Or can you? In a March 15, 2023, report, *The Dallas Morning News* provided this alarming (but not unexpected) admission from Biden TSA chief David Pekoske:

> "We're upgrading our camera systems all the time, upgrading our lighting systems," Pekoske said. "(We're) upgrading our algorithms, so that we are using the very most advanced algorithms and technology we possibly can."
>
> He said passengers can also choose to opt out of certain screening processes if they are uncomfortable, *for now. Eventually, biometrics won't be optional*, he said. [Emphasis added.]

"Eventually" is coming sooner than you think. Moving from figurative to literal, you may be *forced* to take your REAL ID and facial/biometric data to the bank in order

to access your savings or engage in any commerce, if we allow this Big Brother/Big Tech Surveillance State digital technology trap to continue racing forward.
— William F. Jasper

Are DNA Inclusion, Microchip Implants Next?

There are brainiacs and megalomaniacs at universities, think tanks, the United Nations, and outfits such as the World Economic Forum who insist that we must go to, or at least consider going to, the "next level" of biometric security. What's that? DNA (blood, urine, tissue samples) is a big item, considered "the gold standard in identity verification." (Must get newborn Johnny or Suzie bio-stamped before they leave the hospital.) Many biometric identification technologies have been developing for years, with various iterations and combinations of these options already employed in private and governmental institutions: voice, face, fingerprints, palm prints, hand geometry, ear shape, iris, eye veins, periocular, scars, odor, footprint, gait, typing habits, gestures, and more. Of course, as we've reported, the frightening push for microchip implants has been underway for some time. See here, here, here, and here.
— William F. Jasper

"Ugly Stripper" TSA vs. Senators in Battle Over Facial Scans

Senators John Kennedy (R-La.), Ted Cruz (R-Texas), Mike Lee (R-Utah), and Tommy Tuberville (R-Ala.) are locked in battle with the Trump administration over the Transportation Security Administration's intrusive facial recognition technology. President Trump and many of his officials have bought much of the Big Tech cost-cutting/efficiency argument in favor of incorporating AI and the latest technology into virtually the entire government bureaucracy. No doubt, much of the Fedgov organization and workforce could be dramatically downsized, with improved performance, by modernizing outdated technology. But do we have to go full Orwellian and plug into the Borg?

Some senators are pushing back. They are upset that TSA improperly stepped in recently to kill a bill aimed at restricting TSA's face scanning technologies. Sen. Kennedy, ever ready with a colorful comment, accused the agency of "working like an ugly stripper to kill this bill."

Politico reported:

> Republicans who support the measure say it was the TSA itself, with the encouragement of its politically appointed leadership, that assumed a critical role in orchestrating the lobbying campaign that grew opposition and forced the legislation to be scrapped at the last minute from the markup docket.
>
> The episode is now exposing a rift between an administration that wants to increase the use of technology to slash bureaucracy at federal agencies and Republican privacy hawks on Capitol Hill who don't like being undermined.
>
> "The short answer is yes; the long answer is hell yes," said Sen. John Kennedy (R-La.), a co-sponsor of the bill, when asked if TSA had been raising concerns. "They're working like an ugly stripper to kill this bill, which tells me we're doing the right thing."
>
> A senior Senate GOP aide, granted anonymity to speak candidly, said earlier in the week that the "smears against [the] bill have TSA's fingerprints all over it."

The Politico article reported that an unnamed Senate aide "said TSA's effective lobbying against the bill would 'not bode well' for the potential confirmation prospects of Ha Nguyen McNeill, the current acting head of the agency whom President Donald Trump is expected to nominate to serve as permanent administrator." It also "potentially puts McNeill at odds with Kristi Noem, secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, which houses TSA: Noem is not opposed to the

legislation, according to a senior DHS official granted anonymity to share the secretary's private views."

Politico further notes that McNeill is a former executive at a company that supplies AI-powered facial recognition software to airports, which the company touts as being able to match a photo against a gallery of millions of mugshots in a matter of milliseconds.

Abolish? Why not? In an extensive article last March, Veronika Kyrylenko reported on the Abolish TSA Act, introduced by Senators Lee and Tuberville. This deserves serious, rapid consideration. Efficiency is good; tyrannical efficiency, not so much. — William F. Jasper

Heroic Whistleblower Nurse Exposes Covid Vax and Fetal Deaths

Michelle Spencer is a registered nurse and whistleblower from Fresno, California, who has exposed skyrocketing rates of stillbirths since the Covid-19 vaccine rollout to pregnant women.

"Healthy moms and healthy babies were suddenly being replaced by babies born dead, and nobody seemed to care," says Spencer. "I saw a pattern, clear as day, and I couldn't stay silent." When her employer verified in an internal hospital email a record 22 fetal deaths in a single month in 2022, Spencer shared it with Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. (of Children's Health Defense, at the time).

CHD is funding Spencer's legal fees in her lawsuit against her employer for retaliating against her whistleblower efforts and failing to divulge stillbirth data for public use. — Rebecca Terrell

See Rebecca Terrell's important interview with this courageous RN: "Michelle Spencer: Lawsuit Exposes Covid Stillbirths and Defends Vaccine Informed Consent."

Trump's Constitution-crushing National Guard Coup in Washington, D.C.

Donald Trump's recent unilateral takeover of Washington, D.C.'s police force — deploying 800 National Guard troops under the hollow excuse of an "emergency" — is not just unwise. It is unconstitutional,

The New American
TOP DAILY HEADLINES
YOUR RED-PILLED INTELLIGENCE SOURCE!
STRAIGHT FROM OUR PAGES TO YOUR INBOX
Follow us on Social Media

authoritarian, and a dangerous precedent for martial law in cities across this republic.

Let us begin where the Founders began: Washington, D.C., was created only to serve as the seat of the federal government, not as a "national capital city" in the European sense. In our federal system, the states are sovereign, and the federal district exists so that no one state would wield undue influence over the national government. It was never intended to be a federalized playground for presidents to use as a political stage, and certainly not to be subjected to military policing on executive whim.

Trump's move invokes Section 740 of the 1973 Home Rule Act, allowing a president to federalize the Metropolitan Police for up to 30 days without congressional approval. That Act was a political compromise — an unconstitutional one at that — because Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution gives Congress "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District. Congress may not constitutionally delegate away this exclusive authority to a local "home rule" government, yet it did so in 1973. That act left D.C. in a state of supervised subservience — self-government on a leash — and Trump has now yanked that leash hard.

Here's the other constitutional problem: the Posse Comitatus Act prohibits using military forces for civilian law enforcement, save for narrow exceptions. The Insurrection Act is one such exception — but Trump's action is not about insurrection or rebellion. His justification of "rising crime" is contradicted by the

truth: violent crime in D.C. is at a 30-year low. That means this is not about safety, it is about control.

By bringing in the Guard, Trump normalizes a military presence in the streets of an American city under circumstances that are neither war nor genuine emergency. The fact that this is the federal district makes it all the more dangerous, because it is under direct federal jurisdiction, a precedent set here will be the model for similar crackdowns in Baltimore, New York, Oakland, or any other city the president decides is "out of control." Today it's D.C. Tomorrow it's anywhere the executive wants boots on the ground.

Let us be clear: The Founders gave us a federal district not to be the president's personal domain, but to keep the federal government itself neutral and limited. Trump's maneuver inverts that principle, turning the federal district into a staging ground for political spectacle and military-police theater.

The dangerous logic at work here is as old as tyranny itself: Declare an "emergency," deploy troops, bypass the ordinary safeguards of civil liberty, and present it all as public safety. History is littered with regimes that used this pretext to cement power. It is the same trick dressed up in modern clothes.

What's worse, because D.C.'s "home rule" rests on an unconstitutional foundation, there is no clear local recourse. The mayor can protest, the council can object, but under the Home Rule Act, they are ultimately powerless against a president willing to pull this trigger. That means the only check left is the people's willingness to refuse and resist this abuse.

This moment must serve as a warning: The continued existence of a federal "emergency" switch for policing the District — one that can be thrown without Congress — endangers not just the people of Washington, D.C., but the whole structure of our Republic. It is a standing invitation for martial law anywhere the executive branch can claim "federal interest."

If we tolerate it in the District, we will soon see it in the states. The president will point to this precedent, claim a "national interest" in local matters, and impose military-backed policing in defiance of the Constitution's division of powers. The Framers understood that the concentration of legislative, executive, and military power in one set of hands is the definition of tyranny. Trump's D.C. power grab moves us in exactly that direction.

No emergency justifies violating the supreme law of the land. No "crime crisis" that does not exist can excuse the imposition of military-police power on a civilian population. The Founders gave us a federal district to protect the independence of the federal government, not to create a city where presidents can rehearse authoritarian control.

We must dismantle the unconstitutional mechanisms that make this possible. The Home Rule Act's emergency provisions must be repealed, the misuse of the National Guard in civilian policing must be stopped, and every American must remember: The Constitution draws the lines, not the president.

If we allow those lines to be blurred in Washington, D.C., they will vanish in every city in America. And when that day comes, the Republic will have been replaced by the very thing our forefathers fought to overthrow. — Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Saving Babies: Texas Town Becomes 79th "Sanctuary City" for the Unborn

On August 11, the City Council of Talco, Texas, (population 494) voted to adopt an ordinance outlawing abortion. The adoption of the measure made the City of Talco the 79th city in the nation, and the 62nd city in Texas, to pass an enforceable ordinance outlawing abortion within city limits. The vote was 2-0-1. This

movement, beginning with Wascom, Texas, in 2019, has gained steam over the past several years, spreading to Ohio, Illinois, New Mexico, Nebraska, Iowa, and Louisiana. Eleven counties have also passed similar ordinances. The group that has spearheaded this great effort is Sanctuary Cities for the Unborn. For our coverage of this campaign to save the most helpless — and most viciously targeted — of our brothers and sisters, see "Texas Town Becomes Seventh to Declare Itself a Sanctuary City for the Unborn," "Lubbock, Texas, Votes to Ban All Abortions; Proclaims Itself a 'Sanctuary City for the Unborn,'" and "Stop Abortion in Your City, With Mark Lee Dickson" (an excellent video interview by Alex Newman with Sanctuary Cities for the Unborn founder Mark Lee Dickson). For a full list of the pro-life sanctuary cities, see here. — William F. Jasper

The Cruel Paradox of Human Nature and the Necessity of Guarding Liberty

It's a sorrowful thing to observe how nearly everything good in this world gets twisted, distorted, and abused. Why? Because people are, by nature, self-centered. They see the world through the lens of "What's in it for me?" And so, what was meant to be a blessing for all becomes a tool for personal gain, whenever it's safe or possible to do so, they seize it for themselves.

Take religion, property, and political power. Each are capable of great good. And yet, time after time, these become engines of corruption and destruction. Why? Because man is perpetually dissatisfied. He craves a kind of happiness that simply isn't available in this life, and because he can't find it, he becomes frantic, always grasping for something more, something next, something beyond.

And here's the cruel irony: The things we long for most never actually arrive. Man's greatest pleasures are always just out of reach. Contentment is perpetually postponed. We chase illusions and call them fulfillment. The only "happiness" we seem to enjoy is built on dreams, fantasies, and projections into the future. Give a man everything he can imagine, and he'll still be discontent. The more he has, the less he values it, because he's always fixated on what he doesn't have.

We say, "If I just had *this*, then I'd be at peace." But even if we get it, we're not satisfied. Because getting more doesn't silence the desire, it feeds it. New possessions create new cravings. And the imaginary wants burn as fiercely as the real ones. The final end of human wanting is the same as the end of life: Death is the only thing that silences our appetite.

Now consider public blessings. In theory, they ought to benefit everyone. But in practice, they're treated as prizes to be hoarded. If every man would simply accept his fair share, society would flourish. But no, every man wants more. And once he gets more, he wants *even more*. Eventually, he wants it all. And even if he had it all, he'd still be restless. Because no matter how much you feed the ego, it's never full.

The man with the most always wants more. With greater wealth and greater power comes greater anxiety. Meanwhile, the man with the least often lives with the least fear.

Some may pretend to scorn power and wealth, and some even reject the usual paths to them. But let's not kid ourselves: Most who do so aren't motivated by virtue. More often, they're driven by laziness, pride, or fear. Disinterest isn't always moral, it's often just convenient.

Let's be honest: Nearly every man alive would love to be rich and powerful, *if* he could get there quickly, painlessly, and without risk. And millions of people gamble their peace, their reputations, and even their lives chasing wealth and recognition. They bankrupt themselves trying to be rich. They ruin their rest trying to find tranquility. They sacrifice honor for the illusion of fame. We sprint toward comfort and chase solitude through crowds, all while lying to ourselves about what we're really after.

Even when we succeed, we're no closer to peace. Human life, as it is now ordered, is a life of restless striving and constant anticipation. To reject this is to reject life itself.

Every human impulse, every motive we act on, is in some measure selfish. But when that selfishness produces good for others, we brand it "virtue." When a man serves the public interest out of his own pride, or his love for praise, or his hunger to matter, we call that disinterestedness. But let's not lie: *he's still serving himself.*

To say a man is disinterested is only to say that his personal glory is tied to serving others. Mankind is his mistress, and he woos her through public service. That may be admirable, but it's still self-serving.

There is no such thing as a man who acts without passion. Our passions drive everything we do. Even the noblest acts are often the children of fear, pride, vanity, shame, or some other internal impulse. If those impulses result in good, we praise them as virtue. If they result in harm, we condemn them as vice. But the fuel is always the same.

What we call "character" is often just the particular combination of passions, accidents, and incentives that shape how a man navigates the world. And the difference between a criminal and a saint is sometimes no more than a change in circumstance, or in the way their desires line up with their opportunities.

The hard truth is this: *almost any man can be corrupted*, if the right pressure is applied in the right way.

Now, this is not said out of bitterness. It's not cynicism for cynicism's sake. It's said because if self-interest is the most powerful force in human nature, then no man should be naïve enough to trust another with unchecked power.

Men will do evil if they can get away with it. History proves this. Trust the wrong man, and you risk ruin. Over and over again, entire nations have collapsed because the people put blind faith in a single individual or small group. Men will break trust as easily as they breathe, and the greater the power, the greater the temptation. Give a man a little, and he'll want more. Give him much, and he'll still want more. *No amount of authority will ever satisfy the lust for more authority.*

Those who speak most reverently about "the dignity of human nature" have understood it least. The entire history of government is the history of self-preservation. Government didn't rise out of noble idealism, it came from men trying to protect themselves from each other. And every time government has been abused or turned to tyranny, the root cause has been the same: someone looking out for Number One. We've seen it a thousand times. One man destroys a million lives for his own ambition. Others follow him, because their own self-interest leads them to believe they can ride the same wave.

That's the root of all the suffering we inflict on each other: We love ourselves more than we love humanity. We act according to what profits us, even if it hurts everyone around us. The only way to secure ourselves from such predatory impulses is through force of law and equal justice. Laws hold people in check within society; armies hold one society in check against another. Treaties are written in ink but honored only by fear and strength. Nations obey them only when it serves their interest, and individuals are no different. Justice and peace among men are not the product of goodwill. They're the product of deterrence.

So here is the real state of things: No man is safe unless it's in another man's interest to let him be. People behave well not because they're saints, but because it's easier than misbehaving. Some people are "honest" because it pays. Others are dishonest because that's what pays better. Their goals are the same — advantage — but they take different paths to it.

When governments are built on trust — especially trust in individuals — they are built on sand. A constitution that grants more power than necessary, or trusts men more than it must, is a constitution already decaying. That's how tyrants rise. That's how republics fall. That's how standing armies become the tools of Caesar, Cromwell, and Napoleon. How strange it is: People put too much faith in one man and become slaves — and then, when they finally distrust everyone, they remain slaves.

Some may object, "If men are so corrupt, so bent toward evil, why fight for their freedom at all? Why resist tyranny, if the people are just as wicked as their rulers?"

The answer is simple: *Yes, men are wicked. But that doesn't justify oppression.* Why should one corrupt man hold power over another who is no worse than he? The human condition is already marked by suffering, so why make it worse? If we can limit the power of evil by enforcing justice, that is a noble ambition. We're not demanding philosophical virtue from the people, we're demanding that they be *rational*. That they pursue virtue as *interest* and feel the cost of abandoning it. That's all society requires — not saints, just men who behave themselves because they're better off doing so. That's the kind of virtue that can be trusted. That's the virtue a free people must demand, and a wise system must enforce.
— Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

[END]